Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed May 26, 2010.

I.   Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed May 26, 2010, Claims 1-8, 15-29 and 31-34 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 4-6, 15-18, 21, 23-25, 28 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,804,682 hereinafter Kemper) in view of Kiernan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,701,137 hereinafter Kiernan). Claims 3, 8, 20, 22, 27, 29 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper and Kiernan in view of Chan et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0028364 hereinafter Chan). Claims 7, 19 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper and Kiernan in view of Timbol (U.S. Patent No. 6,237,135 hereinafter Timbol). Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper and Kiernan in view of Birkler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,951 hereinafter Birkler). Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper and Kiernan in view of Bunnell (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,122 hereinafter Bunnell).

II.   Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 3-8, 15-21, 28, 31-34, and cancels Claims 22-27, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-8, 15-21, 28-29 and 31-34.

III.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 4-6, 15-18, 21, 23-25, 28 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper in view of Kiernan. Claims 3, 8, 20, 22, 27, 29 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper and Kiernan in view of Chan. Claims 7, 19 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper and Kiernan in view of Timbol. Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper and Kiernan in view of Birkler. Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper and Kiernan in view of Bunnell.

- 7 -

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the following:

> 1.   (Currently Amended) A system for supporting application deployment, comprising:
> a plurality of deployment descriptor files that are adapted to describe deployment and configuration information of a plurality of applications deployed on a web server, wherein each application of the plurality of applications is associated with at least one deployment descriptor file of the plurality of deployment descriptor files and each said application is deployed in a project directory of a plurality of directories in the web server; and
>> a builder component capable of
>>> creating a master tree data structure based on a present state of all deployment descriptor files, wherein the master tree data structure represents resources associated with the plurality of applications, wherein the master tree data structure includes a first sub-tree that corresponds to a first application of the plurality of applications;
>>> creating a first separate tree data structure based on a current state of source files in a first project directory of the plurality of directories associated with the first application, wherein the first separate tree data structure represents resources associated with the first application;
>>> comparing the first sub-tree that corresponds to the first application in the master tree data structure with the first separate tree data structure; and
>>> refreshing the master tree data structure based on the first separate tree data structure if the first sub-tree in the master tree data structure is different from the first separate tree data structure.

Kemper provides a method of managing resources for a single software application (Abstract; Figure 4; Column 9, Lines 48-50). Kemper further discloses a project pane that contains a list of the open projects and a tree view of the contents of the active project (Column 10, Lines 2-4).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that, neither the project pane, nor the projects, can be interpreted as a plurality of deployment descriptor files that are adapted to describe deployment and configuration information of a plurality of applications deployed on a web server.

Additionally, as stated in the pending Office Action, Kemper does not teach creating a separate tree data structure based on a current state of source files in an application's project directory.

Kiernan discloses a process of ripping a parent tree to create a child tree (Column 10, Lines 47-48). Furthermore, once a child tree is created, it maintains a master-client relationship with the master. All actions are centered on the master. When a user edits a tree control, the tree control reports the change to the master (Column 10, Lines 49-60).

- 8 -

However, the child tree in Kiernan is created based on the parent tree, whereas the separate tree, as embodied in Claim 1, is not created based on the master tree.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no indication in Kiernan that a separate tree is created based on a current state of source files in a project directory associated with an application, while the master tree is created based on a present state of all deployment descriptor files.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 15 and 21

The comments provided above with regard to Claims 1 are herein incorporated by reference. Claims 15 and 21 have been amended in a manner similar to Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 15 and 21, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor rendered obvious in view of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8, 16-20, 22-29 and 31-34

Claims 2-8, 16-20, 22-29 and 31-34 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 1, 2, 4, 15-16, 21 and 23. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V.   Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: <u>August 26, 2010</u>

By: <u>/Kuiran (Ted) Liu/</u>
       Kuiran (Ted) Liu
       Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No. 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800

- 10 -